

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES vs VALERO TERMINATING AND DISTRIBUTION  
Nancy Coleman 08/24/2022

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Exhibit

15

exhibitsticker.com

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES, )  
LLC, an Oklahoma Limited )  
Liability Company, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 v. )  
 ) Case No. CIV-19-425-Raw  
VALERO TERMINATING AND )  
DISTRIBUTION COMPANY; )  
VALERO PARTNERS OPERATING )  
CO. LLC; and VALERO )  
PARTNERS WYNNEWOOD, LLC, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

VIDEO DEPOSITION OF NANCY COLEMAN, PhD

TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF

IN OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

ON AUGUST 24, 2022

REPORTED BY JILL TUCKER SHAW, CSR #1459

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES vs VALERO TERMINATING AND DISTRIBUTION  
Nancy Coleman 08/24/2022

Pages 58..61

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1       A. There were a few trace quantities of TPH DRO 2 found in the soil.</p> <p>3       Q. And you -- did you discuss that in your 4 report?</p> <p>5       A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>6       Q. Okay. Because -- and what was your -- what 7 was your opinion about those diesel quantities found 8 in the soil?</p> <p>9       A. They were below the evaluative human health 10 criteria that I was using to evaluate the soil data, 11 and so therefore I did not consider them to be 12 significant.</p> <p>13       Q. But they weren't zero; correct?</p> <p>14       A. No. There were some non zeroes, but I also 15 -- it's possible, given the low number -- the low 16 concentrations that those may actually be a product 17 of naturally occurring carbon compounds which are in 18 the same range as C ranges.</p> <p>19       Q. Okay. Doctor, are you an analytical 20 chemist?</p> <p>21       A. No, I am not.</p> <p>22       Q. Okay. Did you -- do you know how to run a 23 mass spectrometer?</p> <p>24       A. No, I do not.</p> <p>25       Q. Okay. Did you -- were you asked to evaluate</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 any of these things as an analytical chemist?</p> <p>2       A. No, I was not.</p> <p>3       Q. And I believe you've already stated, and I 4 just want to make it clear, you didn't perform any of 5 the laboratory testing yourself on this; correct?</p> <p>6       A. No, I did not.</p> <p>7       Q. Okay. So this could have been naturally 8 occurring diesel?</p> <p>9       A. No. It could have been naturally occurring 10 compounds that occur in this -- that show up in a 11 total petroleum hydrocarbon DRO analysis, because 12 they are in the carbon range that that particular 13 analysis covers.</p> <p>14       Q. So --</p> <p>15       A. And depending on the method and the cleanup 16 that takes place in the lab -- and to do that, to 17 look at those issues, you'd need to look at the 18 chromatograms. And I believe another expert looked 19 at the chromatograms. That is not my area of 20 expertise. I deal in concentration only.</p> <p>21       Q. Okay. In all your review of data, did you 22 find any source of metals, toxic metals, that caused 23 you any concern?</p> <p>24       A. That -- in a few of the soil samples that 25 were actually analyzed for metals, there were a few</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 what would be considered naturally-occurring metals 2 here in Oklahoma. I looked at those in comparison to 3 what are the accepted median background soil levels 4 for metals in Oklahoma, and they were all below that.</p> <p>5       Q. Okay. Let's just talk about one of them, 6 like barium by chance.</p> <p>7       You find barium is naturally occurring in 8 most Oklahoma soil?</p> <p>9       A. Most all Oklahoma soils have measurable 10 levels of barium.</p> <p>11       Q. Do you find higher measurable levels of 12 barium where oil and gas production has occurred?</p> <p>13       A. That is not necessarily a true statement.</p> <p>14       Q. What about where oil and gas refining has 15 occurred?</p> <p>16       A. Again, not necessarily a true statement.</p> <p>17       Q. Where would you expect to find higher levels 18 of barium concentration?</p> <p>19       A. Depends on the geological formation of the 20 underlying soil.</p> <p>21       Q. What about the soil at the Lazy S Ranch with 22 a natural karst limestone formation with an aquifer 23 underneath it? Would you expect to find natural 24 barium occurring there?</p> <p>25       A. I would -- I would expect to find</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 naturally-occurring barium in all soils in Oklahoma.</p> <p>2       Q. So flip to No. G in your report, Doctor. I 3 want to kind of run through some of your opinions on 4 page 23.</p> <p>5       And, Doctor, I know we said earlier that 6 you'd ruled out that any of the chemicals or metals 7 you found came from the pipeline, correct, with 8 absolute certainty?</p> <p>9       A. I don't believe that's what I said.</p> <p>10       Q. Okay. Put it in your words, not mine.</p> <p>11       A. I said that given the soil and water data as 12 analyzed, there was no compelling evidence that there 13 had been releases of petroleum hydrocarbons from the 14 pipeline.</p> <p>15       (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 43 was marked for 16 identification purposes.)</p> <p>17       Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Doctor, I'm going to hand 18 you what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 43.</p> <p>19       This is a document that was produced by Valero that 20 was part of an Excel spreadsheet that's marked 21 StanTech 00000224. It has to do with the previous 22 release in the pipeline and some of the chemical 23 levels that were around the pipeline release.</p> <p>24       Can you take a minute and take a look at 25 this document?</p>

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES vs VALERO TERMINATING AND DISTRIBUTION  
Nancy Coleman 08/24/2022

Pages 74..77

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 A. That is correct.</p> <p>2 Q. And I think -- if I misstate your testimony,</p> <p>3 correct me, please. And you found to -- it was</p> <p>4 present -- some of these things were present, but not</p> <p>5 at significant harmful levels. Is that also correct?</p> <p>6 A. Not at levels which exceeded the established</p> <p>7 health-based evaluative criteria that I was using.</p> <p>8 Q. Right. But it was present?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 MR. CANTWELL: Objection.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. So in your judgment,</p> <p>12 pollution on property owned by another person in</p> <p>13 Oklahoma is okay as long as it's just a little bit?</p> <p>14 MR. CANTWELL: Objection.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: That's not what I'm saying.</p> <p>16 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. So is it okay to</p> <p>17 pollute just a little bit?</p> <p>18 A. I didn't say that and I wouldn't say that.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So you would agree that any pollution</p> <p>20 is bad; correct?</p> <p>21 A. Within the definition of pollution which</p> <p>22 takes into account quantities.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Because that -- can that pollution</p> <p>24 lead to contamination?</p> <p>25 MR. CANTWELL: Objection.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: It depends on the conditions.</p> <p>2 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) How would you define</p> <p>3 contamination, Doctor?</p> <p>4 A. In my practice, typically, it has been</p> <p>5 levels of contaminants which exceed a human health</p> <p>6 evaluative criteria.</p> <p>7 (Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 42 was marked for</p> <p>8 identification purposes.)</p> <p>9 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Okay. So, Doctor, I'm</p> <p>10 going to hand you what's been previously marked</p> <p>11 Plaintiff's 42. And sometimes when I'm searching</p> <p>12 through things, I just -- I like to just look at, you</p> <p>13 know, how Merriam-Webster would define a word of</p> <p>14 contaminate. And I just looked at the first version</p> <p>15 of that. They define contaminate as soil, stain,</p> <p>16 corrupt, or infect by contact or association or to</p> <p>17 make inferior or impure by admixture.</p> <p>18 Would you say either one of those terms</p> <p>19 would be relevant here? Definitions?</p> <p>20 A. No. Because in risk assessment, we use the</p> <p>21 concept of concern, and concern relates to exceeding</p> <p>22 a health-based criterion.</p> <p>23 Q. So what you're -- what you're looking at is</p> <p>24 more definition No. 2, to make unfit for use;</p> <p>25 correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. But you would agree with me that there was</p> <p>3 some contamination to the water and soil at Lazy S</p> <p>4 Ranch?</p> <p>5 MR. CANTWELL: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: There was certain chemicals</p> <p>7 found at low levels in water and soil. Where they</p> <p>8 came from or whether they were associated with</p> <p>9 naturally-occurring sources of some of that material,</p> <p>10 I cannot tell you.</p> <p>11 Q. (BY MR. GARRETT) Because that was not part</p> <p>12 of your --</p> <p>13 A. That was not part of my review --</p> <p>14 Q. Got it.</p> <p>15 A. -- nor is the data suffi- -- the data</p> <p>16 collected for the site sufficient to make that</p> <p>17 statement.</p> <p>18 Q. The data that you were provided is not</p> <p>19 sufficient to make that statement; correct?</p> <p>20 A. Correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. So let's -- we were looking at your</p> <p>22 opinions and they were slightly different from the</p> <p>23 ones at the beginning to the end. So flip back to</p> <p>24 page 4 in your opinion, second -- second bullet</p> <p>25 point, where you say, "The soils, as analyzed, are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 acceptable for the most conservative exposure</p> <p>2 scenarios." Do you see that?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. So basically, you're stating that the soils</p> <p>5 and waters do not require remediation under Oklahoma</p> <p>6 environmental regulatory agency policies, is that</p> <p>7 correct, based on the data you were provided for your</p> <p>8 analysis?</p> <p>9 A. Based on the data I was provided and my</p> <p>10 analysis of that data, it was my opinion that the</p> <p>11 levels were below evaluative human health criteria</p> <p>12 and therefore there was no need to consider</p> <p>13 remediation.</p> <p>14 Q. But when we looked at the statute 27A</p> <p>15 2-6-105, the statute we looked at earlier, it says</p> <p>16 it's unlawful for any person to cause pollution in</p> <p>17 any waters in the state.</p> <p>18 Is that what that statute says?</p> <p>19 A. That's what that statute says, but 20 -- the</p> <p>20 definition of pollution in Title 27A indicates that</p> <p>21 you can consider quantities and whether or not it</p> <p>22 constitutes a nuisance or public health threat or</p> <p>23 disrupts a beneficial use, which is also contained in</p> <p>24 the definition you provided. It just doesn't include</p> <p>25 the word quantities.</p>

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES vs VALERO TERMINATING AND DISTRIBUTION  
Nancy Coleman 08/24/2022

Pages 110..113

		Page 110	Page 111
1	individuals running the testing --		
2	A. Yes, I do.		
3	Q. -- things of that nature? Okay.		
4	But none of those were provided to you to		
5	review --		
6	A. No.		
7	Q. -- in this case?		
8	A. No.		
9	MR. GARRETT: Okay. That's all the		
10	questions I have, Doctor. Thank you so much for your		
11	time today.		
12	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.		
13	MR. CANTWELL: She'll read and sign.		
14	(Signature required; witness excused;		
15	deposition concluded at 12:26 p.m.)		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		Page 112	Page 113
1	WITNESS NAME: NANCY COLEMAN		
2	IN RE: Lazy S Ranch v. Valero Companies		
3	DATE TAKEN: 8/24/2022		
4	REPORTER: JTS		
5	Reasons for making changes are:		
6	(1) To clarify the record;		
7	(2) To conform to the facts; or		
8	(3) To correct major transcription errors.		
9	PAGE LINE	CHANGE FROM	CHANGE TO
10			REASON
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	DATE: _____	WITNESS SIGNATURE: _____	

LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES vs VALERO TERMINATING AND DISTRIBUTION  
Nancy Coleman 08/24/2022

Pages 114..115

<p>1 C E R T I F I C A T E</p> <p>2 STATE OF OKLAHOMA ) 3 COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA ) 4 I, JILL TUCKER SHAW, C.S.R. for the State of 5 Oklahoma, certify that NANCY COLEMAN was by me sworn 6 to testify the truth; that the deposition was taken 7 by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed and is 8 a true and correct transcript of the testimony of the 9 witness; that the deposition was taken on August 24, 10 2022, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; that I am not an 11 attorney for or a relative of either party, or 12 otherwise interested in this action.</p> <p>13 Witness my hand and seal of office on this, 14 the 8th day of September, 2022.</p> <p>15 <i>Jill Tucker Shaw</i></p> <p>16 JILL TUCKER SHAW, C.S.R. 17 Oklahoma Certified Shorthand Reporter 18 Certificate No. 01459 19 Expiration Date: December 31, 2022</p>	<p>Page 114</p> <p>1 MEMORANDUM</p> <p>2 TO: STEPHEN L. JANTZEN 3 Attorney at Law 4 Ryan Whaley 400 North Walnut Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73104</p> <p>5 FROM: WORD FOR WORD REPORTING 6 620 NORTH ROBINSON, SUITE 202 OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73102</p> <p>7 DATE: SEPTEMBER 9, 2022</p> <p>8 STYLE: LAZY S RANCH PROPERTIES, LLC v. 9 VALERO TERMINALING AND DISTRIBUTION COMPANY, ET AL.; NO. CIV-19-425-RW</p> <p>10 Please have NANCY COLEMAN read the 11 deposition enclosed in the above-styled case and sign the jurat page before a notary public. Also, please 12 have NANCY COLEMAN make any needed corrections on the 13 enclosed errata sheet and not directly on the transcript.</p> <p>14 Please return the signed jurat page and errata sheet to my office within 30 days of the date 15 of receipt so that we can forward the original deposition transcript to the attorney who took the 16 deposition. If we do not receive the signed jurat and errata sheet back by said date, we will file the 17 original deposition as-is with the attorney who took the deposition.</p> <p>18 Thank you for your attention and cooperation 19 in this matter.</p> <p>20 cc: D. Mitchell Garrett</p>
--	---